


NLD

FLIP: 13 Mark Whitby v. 20 Samantha Swayze

Novice L-D Debate	Kshitiz Singh (*16)	
Finals	Room 863	Sat 02/11/17 05:30PM
Affirmative Mark Whitby	Points (20-30) 300	Negative Samantha Whitby Swayze Points (20-30) 300
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature  16 School / Affiliation / Occupation
Is this a low point win? _____		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- Bear in mind that facing racist speech is never a good thing, regardless of how "used" to it one is
- She brings up "anarchy" which is a huge jump
- Not sure what economic background he is on / trying
- She doesn't need to explain each legal ramification of hate speech - that's not the resolution
- I don't really care about judge's background - remember the paradises I laid out
- DO!!!!!! the deb point is a YUGE reach dude
- nice clean extension
- You dropped most of the NEG - that gives her a LOT of offense
- The plan text seems a bit unnecessary too
- The "individual" as testimony is not as powerful as you think - it's just one line
- Remember, the "psychological" violence often leads to real violence


Neg

- Establish the difference between collegiate consequences and legal repercussions - the two are VERY different
- Just read the constructive (@initially)
- You need stand for your cont 1
- Do some cross-applying w/ your cards on his case
- Good sign post, but racist comments are not patronizing (slow down)
- Bring up the fact that you have stand and he has a meaningless narrative
- Your cards do say that
- that's a bad concession in 1st cross (recall that you aren't upholding the Equo in most cases)
- what's probably going to take you the round is the status quo comment
- You spend too much time on the semantics of your observation (not a huge issue)
- You don't need to explain why racist speech is bad - I know - that, esp. because he conceded it
- SLOW DOWN

Talamantez, Traci

NLD

FLIP: 13 Mark Whitby v. 20 Samantha Swayze

Novice L-D Debate		David Rice (#34) - Traci Talamantez (53)	
Finals		Room 863	Sat 02/11/17 05:30PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Mark Whitby	25	Samantha Swayze	26
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		Bonita Vista	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st Speech:

- laid out case clearly
- would like to hear more data/evidence to support contentions rather than focus on examples

Cross #1 (answer):

- answered questions clearly & succinctly
- allowed frustration to show when opponent did not allow you to finish answers

Cross #2 (ask):

2nd Speech:

- addressing NEG case w/ argument of students' background is valid
- clarified evidence/data to support own contentions

Final Speech:

- your interpretation of AFF case is different from mine
 - her case is not trying to eliminate racism, but racist talk

(OVER)

1st Speech

- presented own case clearly w/ strong evidence/examples/data to support
- addressed each contention from AFF, and addressed issues w/ AFF plan

Cross #2 (answer)

- questions answered well - able to support own case

2nd Speech:

- made voting issues clear by pointing out framework issues and points not addressed by opponent
- speech codes argument very strong
- organization of this speech was all over the place
 - good points made, but not presented in an organized way

1st cross (ask):

- very organized approach to address opponents case
- need to allow opponent to finish answering your questions
- code of conduct violating free speech is a powerful angle

- * lots of nervous energy
- * don't apologize during your speech - ~~makes~~ weakens your case & credibility

NLD

FLIP: 13 Mark Whitby v. 20 Samantha Swayze

Novice L-D Debate	Nichiel Ferris (#29) Marlene Pearce	
Finals	Room 863	Sat 02/11/17 05:30PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative Points (20-30)
Mark Whitby	30	Samantha Swayze 29
The winner of this debate was		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative	<input type="radio"/> Negative	<u>Mark Pearce</u> Judge's Signature
(Circle Winner)		ACP / Parent / Engineer School / Affiliation / Occupation
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both built a strong framework. Turning the GPA drop evidence was important to me, as well as the cited reference on the failed similar effort to restrict in GB + escalated tension + violence. Compelling historical reference which went pretty much unrefuted.

I would have liked to see better crystallization in the neg closing - the assertion at the end felt more sympathetic opinion than supported fact. One thing that may have helped the psychological harms case is to extend it to the physical manifestations from the psych. harms. Great round - you both have skills that will take you fer!